

ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon the Responses of the

ATHENIAN MERCURY,

To the Questions about

Infant-Baptism.

Quest. 1. **W** *Hether is commonly taught?*
Baptism is the proper and natural
Antitype of Circumcision?

In your Answer you beg when you should dig, and take that for our Concession, which is not, viz. 1. That whole Families were baptized of the profelyted Gentiles in their Initiation among the Jews. 2. You are so far from answering the Query, *Whether Circumcision be a proper Type of Baptism?* tho you affirm it, you do not confirm, but rather give away your Cause, and say that it was not properly a Type, but rather a Continuation of a Custom. And whereas you tell the World, St. John, Christ, and his Apostles have added unto it all that was necessary to make it a full and proper Type; you leave them as wise as you found them, for you speak not one word what those things were that made it a proper Type which they added. And whereas you call Pedobaptism a Consecration or Seal of the Covenant, tho you reflect upon our Ignorance, as not understanding Customs of Nations, Linguisms, Radixes, you would account him an ignorant Man that should seal a Blank. Pray what certainly is sealed to the Infant then? is it Remission, Salvation? if this be God's Seal, you need not question the performance; but I hope you have stronger Expectations of your own Salvation than of every Infant you baptize. In sealing among Men there is something antecedent to it, but I know nothing antecedent to this for Encouragement, unless it be a good warm Benefice. This old Custom, says Dr. Hammond, was the way of proselyting Gentiles and whole Families by Baptism, and was, say you, the likeliest way for the Lord's Ambassadors to find least Opposition. Sirs, was the Dispensation of the Gospel calculated to please Mens Humours? or rather, Is not the whole Administration of it to abate the Pride of Man? Did the Lord say unto his Apostles, when he gave them his Commission to preach and baptize, I have ordained such Ordinances, in the which you are not like to meet with much Opposition? But you, Gentlemen, know they met with quite a contrary Treatment in the discharge of their Duty, both from Jews and Greeks; unto one the Gospel-Dispensation was a Scumbling-Block, to the latter a Scoff.

You are exceedingly out about Coloss. 2. in asserting that the Anabaptists being interrogated about the Sense, must either be silent, or give your Exposition; Sirs, we will do neither. That we may give the true Sense of the place, this Circumcision is not the Circumcision in Controversy, for this is said to be without hands, the Legal one was by hands; this is Spiritual, that Corporal; the Legal one Natural, this Moral; that was a

taking off the fore-Skin of the Flesh, this is a putting off the sinful Body of Sin. The Apostle informs us how this came to pass through the Circumcision of Christ, that is, by Christ's shedding his Blood upon the Cross, by which he procured the Holy Spirit for Mortification, Sanctification unto all the Subjects of eternal Love; and this putting off the Old Man, saith the Apostle, is figured out in Baptism, v. 12. together with your Resurrection to a new Life; and this is done upon the Soul by Faith, which requires the same Power to effect it as rais'd Christ from the Dead. Ingenious Gentlemen (I have more freedom to say so than Ingenuous) pray consider for what end the holy Apostle doth borrow this word Circumcision, not to prove that Baptism is the Antitype of it, but for these Reasons which he tells you, namely, to signify Christ's Bloody Sacrifice upon the Cross for Man's Salvation, and the Believers putting off the Old Man. Pray, Sirs, how doth this prove the Point, that Baptism is the proper and natural Antitype of Circumcision? If you could prove your Right no better to an Estate, if in the hands of an honest Lawyer, you would lose it: you see there is no need to be silent, nor give your Paraphrase upon the Text. And whereas you say St. Cyprian concludes the Red Sea to be the Sacrament of Baptism, in 1 Cor. 10. had you said St. Paul, it had gone better down. Sirs, you are to know Baptism was not in use when those things were done the Apostle speaks of, but he borrows the word, because fit for his purpose, to shew forth God's Care of them in the Red Sea, and his gracious Protection, the Cloud over them, the Red-Sea on each side, so encompassed about by Divine Providence, as Persons are encompassed with Water when baptized. And whereas you cunningly add, all these things are our Figures, as if Baptism was Circumcision's Antitype; you have not one word of Circumcision in the Text. What the Apostle intends is express, he supposeth the Manna and the Rock were Types of Christ, and that their Punishments for Sin were to be our Examples; but how foreign this is to the Point in hand, let all wise Men judg. And for that in 1 Pet. 3. 21. proves as little; for there the Apostle sheweth, as the Ark was the instrumental way to save Noah and his Family from the Deluge; so Baptism is a Sign and Symbol unto all that believe Christ's Death and Resurrection, they shall be delivered from the Deluge of Eternal Wrath. But how doth this prove Circumcision a Type of Baptism? Indeed, had the Apostle mentioned Circumcision antecedent to Baptism, as he doth the Ark, and call it the like Figure, it had been more to the purpose. Gentlemen, 'tis disingenuous to apply that as a Type of a Thing, which is no Type of it,

it; and to call that the Antitype of a Type which belongs not to it, but hath another thing exprest as the Type of it by the Apostle. You know every Antitype hath its proper Type; therefore to make that a Type of a thing when another is exprest, argueth either much Inconsiderateness and want of Study upon the Text, or overmuch Boldness to assert things so easily detected. And whatever you may conceive of, there being no need to have it expressly set down in what Method, what Persons, whether Infants or not, should be baptized, the Custom being so well known, our Saviour, who was wiser than we, saw it necessary, or he would never have enjoyned it as necessary, that Persons be taught, believe, repent, before that Ordinance be administered. Is not this a very poor Answer you give to the Query? if Females were not circumcised, why do you baptizethem, if that be the Type of Baptism? You tell us the Impossibility of the *Modus*, or Manner, how makes the Question foreign? this Answer will not satisfy a tender Conscience, nor make many Profelytes; the thing was not impossible to be done upon Females, had it been God's Ordinance, tho could not have been done after the same *Modus*, yet might have been by your own Concession, when you say the Heathens circumcised the NTMOH Nymphs of their Females. Certainly had Circumcision been a Type of Baptism, the Females would have been the Subjects of the Ordinance as well as the Males. You telling the World, Men, Women and Children were baptized among the Heathen before admitted into the Jewish Religion, the Divine Rule having no Tongue to speak this Language, you may as well persuade us to believe Transubstantiation and Purgatory.

Quest. 2. What certain Indubitable Grounds can we have for the Practice of Infant-Baptism.

You answer from the Scripture, and first from the order of the words in the Commission; I am astonished at this Answer, for the order of the words are against you. Do you not confess your selves, that μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, disciple all Nations, or teach all Nations, is before βαπτίζετε, baptizing them? Can Infants be taught and made Christ's Disciples? you know 'tis impossible. And tho you subtilly joyn διδάσκατοι next to βαπτίζετε, which comes not in till the next Verse, because teaching them is there added after Baptism; therefore you will ungentily conclude Persons may be baptized before they are taught, which our Lord himself made a good guard against that, when he saith, Teach them, disciple them first, and yet have need to be taught all their time after, for the perfecting their Graces: The parallel Text which contains the Commission, Mark 16.16. explains Mat. 28. this saith, let them first be taught, Mark, saith let them first believe, and St. Peter saith, Repent, and be baptized, according to St. John Baptists Doctrine. Whereas you say, μαθητεύσατε, disciple all Nations, contains in it the two others that follow, viz. Baptizing and Teaching, as if they were to be made Disciples first by Baptism, and afterward to be taught, which is quite beside the Text, which saith, make them Disciples by teaching, believing, repenting, then baptize them: yet after this they will have need of teaching. Μαθητεύσατε, say you, signifies to disciple all Nations personally and subjectively; and by baptizing them you make them Disciples: This is a grand mistake, for you are to make them Disciples by teaching, which Infants are not capable of. Go, teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. 'tis as if a King should command an Herald to proclaim, that whatever Person, Male or Female, in the Nation, would learn the Greek Tongue, should have a Wedge of Gold; doth it follow now that every Person in the Nation should have this Gold? every body will say that is a *Nonsequitur*, 'tis he or she only that hath learned the Greek Tongue. So none in the Nation are to be baptized, but what are first taught, When the Prophet Haggai saith, The Desire of all Nations should come, meaning Christ, he doth not mean every individual in the Nation, but

only them which believe would desire his coming. When the Prophet Malachi saith, in the Person of God, You have robbed me, even this whole Nation, doth he intend little Infants had robbed him, or rather the Adult, who were capable so to do? 2. Whereas the *Mercy* saith, Children are capable of Profelytism, because Christ said, Suffer little Children to come unto me, because, say they, the original word is the same with προσελθεῖν, to profelyte: We answer, if the Greek word for Children signifieth, as *Piscator* maintains, one capable of reaching, being observed to be the same word where St. Paul saith to Timothy, From a Child thou hast known the Scriptures; that is, since a Boy, capable to learn; if it be such a Child, we grant he is capable of Profelytism: but if Children here be meant little Infants, as most understand it, then, tho we grant, of such are the Kingdom of Heaven, and may be fit Subjects, by Grace, of the Church Triumphant, yet we deny such to be capable of being made Profelytes in the common acceptation of the word, and so Members of the Church Militant, because they want those Qualifications pre-requisite to such a State, which you grant by not admitting them to the Lord's Supper. But, say you, whole Families were baptized: We say, well they might, seeing they believed, as is asserted of the Jaylor, and his House, Acts 16. 33, 34. So Crispus the chief Ruler believed in God, with all his House, Acts 18. and were baptized; for Lydia and her House, who they baptized, those they comforted, Acts 16. 40. and called Brethren, which cannot be applied unto Infants. The word All in a Text doth not always signify every individual in a Family: 'Tis said that Elkanah and all his House went up to the yearly Sacrifice at Jerusalem, 1 Sam. 1. 21. yet v. 22. it is said Hannah and the Child staid at home. So Augustus Caesar is said to tax all the World, which was no more than that little part where the Roman Empire stretched, Luke 2. As to your Argument of Children being in the Covenant with their Parents, it's well if one in a thousand know what you mean by it. I know but two ways of being in Covenant, that is, absolutely, or conditionally upon Repentance and Faith: you dare not say all the Infant-Seed are in the Covenant in the former sense, for then all shall be saved, and if in Covenant in the latter, so are the Children of Unbelievers the same, and so have the same right to the Seals of the Covenant. This may seem as an Answer to that Query, What Priviledg the Children of Believers have more than those of Unbelievers, besides Prayer, good Examples, with good Education, they cannot have much more by your own Consent: for if every one personally in the Nations ought to be baptized from the Commission, then the Children of Unbelievers have the same Priviledg with that of Believers, the Promise of Remission, and Gift of the Holy Ghost, is the same to the poor Gentiles a far off upon believing, as to the natural Seed of Abraham; and those, tho the Seed of Abraham, enjoy it upon no other account; if we are Christ's, we are Abraham's Seed; we must now reckon from Christ to Abraham, not from Abraham to Christ. The Apostle's Logick is, If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's, this Logick is *jure divino*; but to reckon from Abraham to Christ is *jure humano*; if you are Abraham's, a Child of a Believer, therefore Christ's, is such Logick the holy Apostle condemns, therefore let not Man justify it.

The Holiness mentioned, 1 Cor. 7. is neither inherent nor federal; the Question to the Apostle was, Whether it might be lawful for the believing Husband to put away the unbelieving Wife? so the contrary; the Apostle answers in the Negative, By no means; what is his Reason? why then your Children would be accounted unclean, in plain, Bastards; but in living together they will be accounted holy, that is, legitimate, lawfully begotten in Wedlock: for the Husband is sanctified to the Wife, and the Wife to the Husband in a matrimonial way. The Greek Preposition ἐν is well translated to by the *Geniva*: but what is this to the baptizing Infants? There can be no more concluded, because

cause these Children are said to be holy, therefore to be baptized, than the baptizing *Zacharias's* Bells and Pots, because said to be holy, which the Papists have made holy by Baptism, as some Histories tell us.

Universal Consent of the Churches in all Countries is brought as another Argument for Pedobaptism: I do not remember that ever I read in Holy Writ, that any of the Churches in the Countries of *Asia*, or any other consented to this, but the contrary; the Churches in *Rome*, *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Galatia*, *Philippi*, *Colossae*, *Samaritania*, *Cyprus*, were all for baptizing the Adult; and for any Consent, tho never so general and universal, that agrees not with the Rule of Faith, we have little regard unto it; we have no need of human Authority to confirm Divine Truths.

Tradition, and the uniform Practice of Christian Churches from the first Plantation, is another of your Arguments. We answer with *Dr. Taylor*, Tradition Apostolical is pretended, that Infants were baptized; but at this, saith he, we are not much moved, for we rely upon the written Word of God as sufficient to establish all true Religion. The pretended Proof for Infant-Baptism being an Apostolical Tradition, is taken from *Dionysius the Areopagite*, *Justin Martyr's* Responses, *Origen's* Homilies, *Cyprian* in an Epistle to one *Pidus*; these have been examined, and found fabulous, and forged. See *Danvers* on Baptism, p. 133, to 150. The Council of *Carthage*, of *Neocaesarea*, *Laodicea*, in the 4th Century decreed the necessity of Confession of Sins, and Profession before Baptism; this takes off both universal Consent and uniform Practice of the Churches, as you asserted. *Dr. Taylor* saith further, Tradition ought to be proved by more than one Evidence, viz. *Origen*, whom all Ages have condemned of Error, and whose Works are so spurious, that one knows not whether he reads *Origen* or *Rufinus*. The pretended Proof brought from Antiquity, is as lame and halting as the rest; our Baptism alone can plead Antiquity, being only found in the Scriptures of Truth; and your selves have fairly confessed, that there is nothing to be found in the Letter of the Word for Pedobaptism. You tell us there were no Congregations of *Anabaptists* until about three hundred Years after Christ: We answer, we know not how there should be any *Anabaptists*, that is, Re-baptizers (as you have confessed we are unjustly called) forasmuch as there were no Infants baptized, or rather sprinkled, until about that time. For your Candor here we do thank you, in confessing implicitly and unavoidably, that Infant-Baptism was not practised until about 300 Years after Christ, and that is the very reason there could be no *Anabaptists*, (viz. Re-baptizers) till then; but there were Baptized Churches many in a few Years after Christ, as that at *Jerusalem*, *Ephesus*, *Galatia*, *Corinth*, *Philippi*, &c. But one thing we must blame you for, that you left a Blank, and gave us no account of the Reason, nor your intent to put in an *Errata* about it in the next; and had I not by meer Providence read the next *Mercury* to that of Baptism, where you supply the Blank, by telling us that it was about 300 Years after Christ, before any Churches of *Anabaptists* were, we could not have given you so full an Answer. 'Tis well known *Augustin* was the first that preached Infant-Baptism necessary, in his heat against *Pelagius*, who denied Original Sin, which *Austin* supposed to be taken away in Baptism, which agreed with the Decree of the Council of *Carthage*; That whosoever did affirm Baptism took not away Original Sin, should be anathematized; had they said the Blood of Christ, it had been more Orthodox. You are not ignorant, I suppose, that about the 5th Century Infant-Baptism was confirmed by the Pope, and his Council at *Milvian*, a Province in *Africa*. *Magdeburg Hist. Cent. 5. p. 835.*

Quest. 3. The Answer to that is honest, as above-said; there is no express word in the Scripture for Infant-Baptism, but appears from necessary Consequences. Sirs, what need we seek to prove our Right

to a good Estate by a dark far-fetched Consequence, which may fail when we have a positive Witness at hand? And were it our business to treat of the Creation of the World, whether made of pre-existent Matter; or Christ being the second Person in the Trinity, born of the Virgin, the Godhead of Christ, we could prove some, if not all, from better Arguments than Consequences; but we have no need to go for Consequences to prove a Gospel-Baptism, because we have a positive Command for it; it is great Folly for Men to feed upon Husks, when they may eat the Fat of the Kidneys of Wheat.

Quest. 4. Why Christ was not baptized before he was thirty Years old? You answer, there is no adhering to a Doctrine before it is instituted, or preached. Gentlemen, you know, or may know, that *John* had his Commission to teach and baptize some time before Christ came to him to subject to that Ordinance. And if Infant-Baptism were much before our Saviour's time, which you beg, 'tis much he was not baptized in his Infancy. You will say to that, it was not then instituted as a Gospel-Ordinance; but this we say, had Infant-Baptism been of God, there is all the reason in the World to believe there would not only have been a Commission for it, but the Matter should have been so ordered, as Christ should have been baptized in his Infancy as our Pattern: but behold 'tis otherwise; therefore the reason why Christ was baptized about thirty Years old, was, that his Commission and Example might correspond, that as he commanded the Adult believing penitent Soul to be baptized, he strengthens his Commission by his Practice, to teach us that Infants of no understanding were not the Subjects of this Ordinance, but the Adult, and those who could give a reason of their Hope with Meekness and Wisdom, and who should desire it with Judgment, Love, and Affection, as the Eunuch, *See, here is Water, what doth hinder? If thou believest, thou mayst*, saith *Philip*, not else, for I dare not go beyond my Lord's Commission.

Quest. 5. In the fifth Question you have been partly fair, and partly foul: fair, in granting the right manner of Administration to be by Dipping, looking upon that way to be a clear Representation of our Saviour's descending into the Grave, abiding there, and rising up again, according as the Apostle makes use of it, when he says, *We are buried with him in Baptism*, these are your own Words. But you have been unfair, yea foul, in a confident asserting that the Church hath Power to dispense with Circumstantials, and the manner of Actions, tho not the Act. But, Sirs, Do not Men dispense with the very Act when they Rantize instead of Baptize? is it not another thing, another Act? Suppose I should bid my Servant to dip any thing all over in the Water, and instead of that he puts his Hand in a Basin and sprinkles some drops of Water upon it, I rebuke him because it answers not my end, being another Act: When the very Essence of a thing is wanting which makes good its Institution, it's then another thing. In Pedobaptism the right Subject and right Form of Administration is wanting, therefore it is another thing. Indeed you do assign a Reason why you sprinkle instead of dip, because our Climate is cold; I am not afraid to say Unbelief, if not Pride, is the Mother of this Argument. Did our Lord except this in the Commission, Go into all the World, teach and baptize, only in cold Countries sprinkle, I remember no such Exception; but 'tis Unbelief's Addition. Did the Martyrs trust God with their Bodies in the Fire, and shall not we trust him in the Water? Pray, Gentlemen, tell us where God hath empowered the Church to dispense with Circumstantials, which are included, yea express in a positive Command? I know not but you might have been very proper for *Mendicant Friars*, and better skill'd in begging than digging. You assert God hath given the

Church such Power, but prove nothing. Hath God less regard to his Worship under the Gospel, than under the Law? Must not a Tool be lifted up to the Altar of rough Stone to beautify it, lest it be defiled with Man's Addition? Is *Uzzah* struck dead for touching the Ark, because not according to the due order, tho done with a well meaning Zeal? Shall the Men of *Bethshemeth* lose Life (abundance of them) for peeping into the Ark? Must *Moses* make the Tabernacle exactly according to the Pattern shewed him in the Mount? Must *Naaman* be confined to wash seven times in *Jordan*, and no other place? and shall any dare to Baptize when God commands them to Baptize? We do not deny but some Circumstantial may be left to the Wisdom of the Church, as to Time, Place, &c. But where God hath plainly and positively expressed his Mind, there must be no alteration, as in the case in hand. To the seventh Response of the seventh Question we have spoken before, concerning Children being in the Covenant. As to your eighth Response to the last Question, Whether Children have Faith or no? you assert they have Faith *potentia*, tho not in *actu visibili*; as an Artist when he is indisposed or asleep is potentially an Artist, tho not actually. Sirs, suppose all you have said should be granted, that Children may have Faith *potentia*, and that of such is the Kingdom of Glory; that God radiates and shines upon the Souls of Children in Heaven. And grant all that to be true you speak about those Children dying in *New England*, all will give no Relief in the Case; for whatever Faith there may be *potentia*, if God requires by an express Law, it must also be in *actu visibili*, actual and visible; nothing can give us a Dispensation to baptize without it, the Commission is plain, *He that believeth, and is baptized, &c.* Dr. Taylor's words will not be impertinently brought in here; for any to assert Infants have Faith, or any other inspired Habit, such are constrained to answer this without Revelation against Reason, common Sense, and all the Experience in the World, no greater advantage can be desired against any Position.

For a close. Whereas, in a way of Reproach, you call some Ring-leaders: we know who it was that called the greatest Apostle a Ring-leader of the Sect of the *Nazarans*: and to assert so positively that those were cast down when they came to die for their patronizing this Doctrine; and that in those Ages wherein Infant-Baptism was opposed, you say it was by such who were grossly erroneous in other things: All this I suppose is as true, as when the Jews said Christ cast out Devils by the Prince of Devils *Belzebub*. But suppose this should be all true, is this good Logick? *Judas* was a Traitor, Ergo, all the Apostles were Traitors. Because some of the Communion of the National Church of *England* die at *Tyburn* almost every Sessions as Criminals; it would be neither good Logick, nor according to the Golden Rule, to say all of that Communion are such.

To conclude; some keep the best Wine till last, but yours seems to be the weakest, to say some Persons do what in them lies to keep their own Children out of the Covenant, and that it is an uncomely Cruelty: Indeed were it true, so it was; but what honest Man, think you, would keep his Children out of the Covenant, if it lay in his Power to bring them there? This we know, God's Covenant is an everlasting Covenant, and it is not in Man to frustrate the absolute Purpose of God: And nothing can be more vain, than to think the doing of a thing never commanded of God, should affect the Souls of our Children. Signs and Seals of the Covenant are to be applied to the proper Subjects. Tho *Lot* was a holy Man, yet he had no such Priviledg as to circumcise his Infant-Seed, because it was limited to *Abraham* and his Seed, the Male-sex, and the eighth day appointed by a special Command; even so Baptism is limited by a positive Command of God to actual Believers.

This is all from him who wisheth you the same Happiness with himself.

H. C.

F I N I S.

ADVERTISEMENT.

There is a Book lately printed, entitled, *Believers Baptism from Heaven, &c. with an Answer to Thomas Wall's Book, Baptism Anatomiz'd: Together with an Answer to a part of Mr. Daniel William's Catechism in his Book to Youth.* In Pag. 121. he propounds these Questions, *What if a Child will not agree, but refuse to agree to the Covenant to which his Infant-Baptism engaged him? Himself makes this astonishing Answer.* 1. It's a rejecting Christ our Saviour, and a renouncing the Blessings of the Gospel. 2. It's the damning Sin. 3. It's the Heart of all Sin. 4. It's Rebellion continued against my Maker. 5. It's Ingratitude and Perjury to my Redeemer. 6. It's gross Injustice to my Parents. 7. It's an Affront to all the godly. 8. It's self-killing Cruelty to my own Soul. In the fore-mentioned Book you have a particular Answer to all these. It is to be had at Mr. Hancock's in Castle-Alley; and at Mr. Dewin's in Popes-head-Alley a Coffee-house.

